

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Vol. 6. Issue.3. 2019 (July-Sept.)

ISSN

INTERNATIONAL  
STANDARD  
SERIAL  
NUMBER  
INDIA

2395-2628(Print):2349-9451(online)

A BRIEF HISTORICAL SURVEY OF TRANSLATION THEORIES AND THEIR  
CONTRIBUTION TO A PRACTICAL ORIENTATION OF THE DISCIPLINE

SERVAIS MARTIAL AKPACA

Université d'Abomey-Calavi, FLLAC, Département d'Anglais

Email:akpacasm@yahoo.fr

doi: <https://doi.org/10.33329/ijelr.63.11>



ABSTRACT

Eric Jacobsen claims in *Translation, A Traditional Craft* (1958) that translation is a Roman invention. No matter whether this statement is true or not, the Roman translators Cicero and Horace were the first to write translation theories that influenced subsequent generations of translators for centuries. They advocated literal as well as free translation. The aim of this paper is to show that the various translation theories developed by authors such as St. Jerome, Richard Rolle, Etienne Dolet, George Chapman, Walter Benjamin and Eugene Nida oriented the practise of this activity in religious and secular circles. The methodology of the paper is mostly descriptive and analytic in the sense that an effort is made to identify several translation theories and to analyse their content and contribution to the practise of the discipline over the years. The result of this investigation is that translation is a great source of language enrichment and inter-lingual communication as well as a channel through which several transactions take place, including coinage, popularisation of foreign cultures and literary traditions, comparative stylistics, research in terminology and rhetoric.

Key words: Translation theories, history, linguistics, culture, science

**Résumé :** Eric Jacobsen affirme dans *Translation, A Traditional Craft* (1958) que la traduction est une invention romaine. Peu importe la véracité de cette affirmation, les traducteurs romains Cicéron et Horace étaient les premiers à écrire des théories de la traduction, qui ont influencé des générations postérieures de traducteurs pendant des siècles. Ils ont plaidé pour une traduction littérale et une traduction non littérale. Le but du présent article est de montrer que les différentes théories de la traduction développées par des auteurs tels que St. Jérôme, Richard Rolle, Etienne Dolet, George Chapman, Walter Benjamin et Eugène Nida ont orienté la pratique de cette activité dans des milieux religieux et laïcs. La méthodologie de l'article est essentiellement descriptive et analytique en ce sens qu'un effort sera fait pour identifier plusieurs théories de la traduction et analyser leur contenu et leur contribution à la pratique de cette discipline au fil des années. Le résultat de cette enquête est que la traduction est une source importante d'enrichissement des langues et de communication entre les langues ainsi qu'un canal par lequel plusieurs

transactions ont lieu, notamment les néologismes, la vulgarisation des cultures et des traditions littéraires étrangères, la stylistique comparée, la recherche en terminologie et la rhétorique.

Mots clés : Théories de la traduction, histoire, linguistique, culture, science

## Introduction

This paper attempts to identify major translation theories throughout history in a bid to describe translation techniques. In *Translation Studies*, Bassnett says that:

No introduction to Translation Studies could be complete without consideration of the discipline in an historical perspective, but the scope of such an enterprise is far too vast to be covered adequately in a single book, let alone in a single chapter. What can be done in the time and space allowed here is to look at the way in which certain basic *lines of approach* to translation have emerged at different periods of European and American culture and to consider how the role and function of translation has varied. So, for example, the distinction between *word for word* and *sense for sense* translation, established within the Roman system, has continued to be a point for debate in one way or another right up to the present, while the relationship between translation and emergent nationalism can shed light on the significance of differing concepts of culture. (Bassnett, 2002: 47)

Indeed, in this book, the author has shed light on a good number of translation theories and most importantly on the way various translators have described the ways they have approached translation in practise. A layman may tend to think that translation is done in only one particular way because it is a science. Actually, a review of translation theories in both historical and thematic perspectives reveals that translators have adopted many approaches to address issues pertaining to culture, syntax, sentence and lexical semantics, figures of style, rhetoric and many more.

Just like Bassnett, Walter Benjamin, a prominent Bible translator and theorist, also addresses the issue of translation theory, saying that:

Real translation is transparent, it does not hide the original, it does not steal its light, but allows the pure language, as if reinforced through its own medium, to fall on the original work with greater fullness. This lies above all in the power of literalness in the translation of syntax, and even this points to the word, not the sentence, as the translator's original element. (Trans. Lefevere 1977:102 - Walter Benjamin)

On the basis of this quotation, it should not be difficult to indicate Benjamin's position on the 'word for word' vs. 'sense for sense' debate. At this stage, it is important to note that translation theories have gone beyond this debate and introduced new concepts and strategies that are going to be discussed within the framework of this paper.

Bassnett says that the German philosopher and theologian Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768–1834) is recognised as the most influential theorist in 19th century translation thinking and, in fact, he appears to have been the first to have raised the very possibility of a discipline of translation studies:

Everywhere theories are the order of the day with us, but up to now no one has provided a theory of translation that is based on solid foundations, that is logically developed and completely worked out – people have only presented fragments. And yet, just as there is a field of scholarship called Archaeology, there must also be a discipline of translation studies. (Trans. Snell-Hornby 2006:6-7, from Schleiermacher 1813)

Indeed, it is necessary to have a discipline called translation studies and to determine whether translation is an art, a science or a craft. Or is translation a sub-discipline of linguistics? A survey of translation theories will enable us to provide an answer to this question.

In the following paragraphs, an attempt will be made to define translation and to review various translation theories. Subsequently, there will be a discussion on the content and the scope of the various theories. In the end, it should be possible to validate or reject some statements and assumptions about translation.

## 1. Definition of Translation and Translation in Practise

### 1.1 Definition of Translation

It is a truism that translation is the transfer of meaning from one language to another. However, it is important to note that there is a difference between linguistic meaning and sense (i.e. the linguistic meaning of a word and the sense of a sentence). To illustrate this point, let us consider a practical definition proposed by Massey.

As supported by many researchers, translation and interpreting can be perceived as the process that allows the transfer of sense from one language to another, rather than the transfer of the linguistic meaning of each word. (Massey, 2009: 25)

This quotation is clear enough to indicate that the transfer of sense takes place at sentence level and not at word level. In other words, in a sentence, each word has a meaning but translation does not transfer the individual meaning of each word; it rather transfers the sense of the whole sentence, which is not the sum of the meanings of individual words. At a later stage, we are going to see that some translation theories advocate 'word for word' translation, whereas others call for 'sense for sense' translation. This dichotomy permeates the discussions on translation theories from time immemorial.

### 1.2 Translation in Practise

In explaining the difference between linguistic meaning and sense, Massey (2009: 26) makes the following point:

In support of this statement I would like to show an example of how a word-by-word translation from Italian into English can produce misleading utterances. Let's take into analysis the following Italian phrases: Fammi avere tue notizie ogni giorno.

A back translation into English would produce: Let me have your news every day. Although the word news (notizie) can be used in both languages in a similar way the English translation sounds extremely unnatural. In English we can have news from somebody, but not your or his or their news. However, even if the utterances were translated as:

Let me have news from you every day, it would not sound spontaneous. A native speaker would probably say: I'd like to hear from you every day. Therefore both the grammatical structure "fammi" and the semantic components used in the original version would be replaced by more appropriate alternatives in English.

This example is clear enough to show that there is, indeed, a difference between linguistic meaning and sense. Suffice it to say that translation is not only about linguistics. There is another dimension of translation that cannot be captured by linguistics. We are tempted to say that this dimension, which is beyond the ambit of linguistics, may be termed the *naturalness* of the translated text. Let us give another example to buttress this statement.

For example, the literary English translation of the Italian phrases:

Il presidente del Consiglio si è recato a Mosca. Would be: The President of the Council went to Moscow. This translation would misinterpret a crucial information in the speech. In fact "Presidente del Consiglio" is one of the ways to designate the Prime Minister in Italian. Thus in most cases if the translation or the interpretation was carried out only on a word level it would either produce utterances that sound very unnatural to the native speaker of the target language or it would distort the meaning. (Ibid)

In this particular example, a cognitive addition is needed to indicate to a non-Italian person that the President of the Council is actually the Italian Prime Minister. Here again the linguistic elements at the disposal of a mere linguist trying to translate this sentence into English would not enable him or her to point out that it is the Italian Prime Minister who is being referred to. However, if an Italian citizen reads a term like the President of the Council, he or she would know that it is the Italian Prime Minister who is being referred to. Furthermore, why are we saying that the President of the Council is the Prime Minister? In fact, we are using this term because we are referring to a target audience which can only understand the term Prime Minister. If we were referring to a German audience, for example, the equivalent of the term President of the Council would become Chancellor because this is the term that is used in Germany to designate the Prime Minister. What about the countries where there is neither a Prime Minister nor a Chancellor? If we were referring to an audience from one of the latter countries, we would find an appropriate term that corresponds to these titles in these countries.

Therefore, it is obvious that translation involves natural as well as cognitive and cultural dimensions, which are beyond the ambit of linguistics.

There is another way of looking at the translation of *Presidente del Consiglio* by the term President of the Council. It may be a deliberate word for word translation intent on introducing a new term in the target language. We are going to see that some translators deliberately show the reader that the text they are reading is a translation, while others choose not to introduce any foreign words or cultural references in their translation.

In the light of the above-mentioned examples, there is a crucial need to explore several translation theories to see what translation entails. Can we take the view that over the years, translation theories have influenced and oriented the practise of this century-long activity?

## **2.. Problem Statement, Methodology and Theoretical Framework**

### **2.1 Problem Statement**

This paper is of the view that there is a relation between the theories and the practise of translation, which cannot be dissociated. Depending on the translator's agenda, translation can be done in a way that hides the foreign origin of a text from the target audience. It is also possible for a translator to introduce in the translation new words, foreign phrases and cultural references in order to show the foreign origin of a text. Other translators adopt a bolder attitude by adapting the text in a way that suits their own taste or that of the target audience. All these approaches refer to theories such as foreignisation, domestication, dynamic equivalence, adaptation or imitation, skopos, functionalism, etc. Against this background, it is useful to ask questions about the role of translation.

In order to answer these questions and to show the relation between the theories and the practise of translation, this paper will adopt the following methodology.

### **2.2 Methodology**

The methodology of this paper is both descriptive and analytical in the sense that explanations will be given on the content and the scope of some selected theories and, then, several theories will be compared in a bid to show their similarities and/or differences. For example, Cicero and Horace advocated both 'sense for sense' and 'word for word' translation whenever it is possible. Other translation theories advocating the same principles or different approaches will be compared to these ones so that general conclusions can be drawn regarding the typology of currents in translation.

### **2.3 Theoretical Framework**

It is not easy to review century-long translation theories in a few pages. That is why this paper does not pretend to review all translation theories. It will simply present a selected number of them. To do this review, the wheel is not going to be reinvented since a lot of research works have already been carried out on this topic which is vast and technical in nature. More specifically, this review will be based on the research

works done by three scholars, namely Mahmoud Ordudari, Andy Cheung and Susan Bassnett although they have adopted different approaches to the review of translation theories.

Indeed, Ordudary has taken a thematic approach to translation theories by presenting them in the context of a study that he has carried out on Culture Specific Concepts (CSC).

Translating culture-specific concepts (CSCs) in general and allusions in particular seem to be one of the most challenging tasks to be performed by a translator; in other words, allusions are potential problems of the translation process due to the fact that allusions have particular connotations and implications in the source language (SL) and the foreign culture (FC) but not necessarily in the TL and the domestic culture.

There are some procedures and strategies for rendering CSCs and allusions respectively. The present paper aims at scrutinizing whether there exists any point of similarity between these procedures and strategies and to identify which of these procedures and strategies seem to be more effective than the others. (Ordudari, 2009: 120)

Unlike Ordudary, Cheung and Bassnett have adopted a historical and chronological approach to translation theories by presenting them right from the beginning, many centuries ago, up to the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Indeed, in Translation Studies, Bassnett says that:

George Steiner, in *After Babel*,<sup>1</sup> divides the literature on the theory, practice and history of translation into four periods. The first, he claims, extends from the statements of Cicero and Horace on translation up to the publication of Alexander Fraser Tytler's *Essay on the Principles of Translation* in 1791... Steiner's second period, which runs up to the publication of Larbaud's *Sous l'invocation de Saint Jérôme* in 1946 is characterized as a period of theory and hermeneutic enquiry with the development of a vocabulary and methodology of approaching translation. The third period begins with the publication of the first papers on machine translation in the 1940s, and is characterized by the introduction of structural linguistics and communication theory into the study of translation. Steiner's fourth period, coexisting with the third has its origins in the early 1960s and is characterized by 'a reversion to hermeneutic, almost metaphysical inquiries into translation and interpretation'... (Bassnett, Op. Cit.:47-48)

It is clear that Bassnett has reviewed the theories of translation by putting them in a historical perspective that started from the time the Romans began to practise this activity and ended in the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

As far as Cheung is concerned, he has taken a similar historical approach to translation theories by distinguishing two periods:

The historical survey is divided into two (rather artificial) halves. The first half includes discussion of translation theory until the end of the 19th century, while the second concerns developments from the beginning of the 20th century but with particular concentration upon the emergence of translation studies following James Holmes. (Cheung, 2011: 22)

The following section will present the translation theories mentioned in Ordudary's paper and will compare them to theories presented in Bassnett's and Cheung's books. Then, an attempt will be made to identify the major currents in translation.

### 2.3.1 Foreignisation and Domestication

In "Translation Procedures, Strategies and Methods", Ordudari (2009: 121) has mentioned Nida's translation theory which recommends: "(a.) an analysis of the source and target languages; (b.) a thorough study of the source language text before making attempts to translate it; (c.) making judgments of the semantic and syntactic approximations. (1964: 241-45) Nida further suggests: "Constant re-evaluation of the attempt made; contrasting it with the existing available translations of the same text done by other

translators, and checking the text's communicative effectiveness by asking the target language readers to evaluate its accuracy and effectiveness and studying their reactions." (Ibid: 246-47).

Nida focuses more on the target language readers. His approach is close to the domestication theory developed by Venuti. Several other translation theorists including Cicero, Horace, Saint Jerome, Etienne Dolet, Martin Luther, William Tyndale and Richard Rolle adopted the domestication approach though some of them confessed that they used a word for word approach whenever it was possible.

Cheung (2011: 24) notes that many centuries ago, Cicero and Horace had expressed similar views on their translation techniques. Indeed, in *De Optimo Genere Oratorum* (The Best Kind of Orator), Cicero mentioned the dichotomy between literal and free translation while introducing his translation of the speeches of Demosthenes and his rival, Aeschines: "And in so doing, I did not hold it necessary to render word for word, but I preserved the general style and force of the language. For I did not think I ought to count them out to the reader like coins, but to pay them by weight, as it were." (Robinson, 1997:9)

In addition to domestication, there is also the foreignisation technique which is going to be discussed in the next section.

Orudari has quoted Venuti (1998:240) who indicates that translation strategies "involve the basic tasks of choosing the foreign text to be translated and developing a method to translate it." He employs the concepts of domesticating and foreignizing to refer to translation strategies." (Op. Cit.: 121)

In discussing the concept of foreignisation, Susan Bassnett explains that the Romans regarded translation as a source of language enrichment and, as a result, their translators used to borrow some words and structures from the Greek texts they translated. "Since the process of the enrichment of the literary system is an integral part of the Roman concept of translation, it is not surprising to find a concern with the question of language enrichment also. So prevalent was the habit of borrowing or coining words..." (Bassnett, 2005:51-52)

Cheung (2011:17-18) says that "An interesting point about Cicero is that he appears to have given thought to the concepts of foreignisation and domestication (as they are known today). He quotes Cicero saying that "By giving Latin forms to the text I had read, I could not only make use of the best expressions in common usage with us, but I could also coin new expressions, analogous to those used in Greek, and they were no less well received by our people, as long as they seemed appropriate." (Cicero 55 BCE; quoted in Lefevere 1990:23-4)

Cheung (Op. Cit.:20) notes that Richard Rolle (c.1300-1349) translated the Psalter from Latin using both the word for word and sense for sense techniques. Later, Etienne Dolet (1509-1546) spoke against the word for word technique in his 1540 publication titled *La Maniere de Bien Traduire d'Une Langue en Aultre* (How to Translate Well from One Language into Another). "3. In translating one must not be servile to the point of rendering word for word." (Weissbort and Eysteinsson 2006:73-4) Dolet's ideas were echoed by George Chapman (1559-1634) while working on his translation of Homer. He said that a translator should "(1) avoid word for word renderings" (Bassnett, Op. Cit.:61). Joachim du Bellay, a member of the French literary circle *Pléiade*, was an advocate of the foreignising technique. (Salama-Carr 2008:406) It should be pointed out that these two techniques had a considerable long-time effect on generations of translators. Indeed, in discussing Martin Luther's translation technique which focuses on reader reception, Munday (2008:24) said that "Luther's treatment of the free and literal debate does not show any real advance on what St Jerome had written 1100 years before."

So far, two currents of translation theory have been discussed and each of them focuses either on the target language or on the source language. However, translation has not only served literary or language purposes but it has also played a political role.



### 2.3.2 Functional Approach to Translation

In Translation Studies, Susan Bassnett makes a point about a new dimension of translation in the 9<sup>th</sup> century when she writes that:

“In translating the *Cura Pastoralis*, Alfred claims to have followed the teachings of his bishop and priests and to have rendered the text ... sometimes word by word, sometimes sense by sense... Translation is perceived as having a moral and didactic purpose with a clear political role to play, far removed from its purely instrumental role in the study of rhetoric that coexisted at the same time. (Bassnett, Op. Cit.:58)

This view is close to a functionalist approach to translation. This particular translation was done to serve a pedagogical purpose at a time when the Danish had invaded England and destroyed the monasteries which used to serve as educational centres. Translation played both a pedagogic and political role in educating the people and raising the English language to the standard of Latin which was predominant at that time. Bassnett says that “Translation was by no means a secondary activity, but a primary one, exerting a shaping force on the intellectual life of the age, and at times the figure of the translator appears almost as a revolutionary activist rather than the servant of an original author or text. (Ibid: 65)

Bassnett names several translators including Cowley who advocated the techniques of imitation and adaptation. “Abraham Cowley (1618–67) goes a stage further, and in his ‘Preface’ to his *Pindarique Odes* (1656) he boldly asserts that he has ‘taken, left out and added what I please’ in his translations. (Ibid: 66) Cowley makes a case for his manner of translating, dismissing those critics who will choose (like Dryden) to term his form of translation ‘imitation’.

Another theorist who developed the notion of imitation was John Dryden. John Dryden (1631–1700), in his important Preface to Ovid’s *Epistles* (1680), tackled the problems of translations by formulating three basic types: “(1) *metaphrase*, or turning an author word by word, and line by line, from one language into another; (2) *paraphrase*, or translation with latitude, the Ciceronian ‘sense-for-sense’ view of translation; (3) *imitation*, where the translator can abandon the text of the original as he sees fit. (Ibid: 66)

Bassnett gives more examples of imitation and adaption, saying that in poetry, the adjustments made to the SL text by such major translators as Wyatt (1503–42) and Surrey (c. 1517–47) have led critics to describe their translations at times as ‘adaptations’, but such a distinction is misleading. An investigation of Wyatt’s translations of Petrarch, for example, shows a faithfulness not to individual words or sentence structures but to a notion of the meaning of the poem in its relationship to its readers. It is clear that the translation process is used to do something other than render Petrarch’s words line for line or recapture the elegiac quality of the original.

In discussing the concept of adaptation or imitation, Cheung (Op. Cit.: 38) stresses that “The 17th and 18th centuries saw important developments with a number of attempts at developing systematic translation theories. One of the discernible traits of this period was the acceptance of adaptation (or imitation), or very free translation, whereby the target text differs extremely from the source text.” This point is confirmed by Bassnett when she says that “The updating of texts through translation by means either of additions, omissions or conscious alterations can be very clearly seen in the work of Philemon Holland (1552–1637) the ‘translator general’.” (Bassnett, Op. Cit.: 64)

The discussion on functionalism cannot be concluded without mentioning the names of Katarina Reiss and Vermeer on the one hand and that of Eugene Nida on the other hand. Cheung mentions Nida’s theory as part of the functionalist approach to translation.

This period, the 1960s and 1970s, has come to be described as “The age of equivalence” (Pym 2004:44; Malmkjær 2005:5) and Nida’s work was well suited to the prevailing thought of the time. He differentiated between two types of equivalence: formal and dynamic. Formal equivalence (later ‘formal correspondence’) attempts to reproduce source text surface structure as closely as possible,

whereas the preferred dynamic equivalence attempts to reproduce the same reader response among target audience readers as that found among source text readers (Nida and Taber 1969:24).

### 2.3.3 Figure for figure

Another translation theory advocates the recreation of the original text in the target language when it comes to poetry. Sir John Denham (1615–69), whose theory of translation, as expressed in his poem 'To Sir Richard Fanshawe upon his Translation of Pastor Fido' (1648) and in his Preface to his translation of *The Destruction of Troy* (1656) covers both the formal aspect (Art) and the spirit (Nature) of the work.

[He] warns against applying the principle of literal translation to the translation of poetry: for it is not his business alone to translate Language into Language, but Poesie into Poesie; and Poesie is of so subtle a spirit, that in pouring out of one Language into another, it will all evaporate; and if a new spirit be not added in the transfusion, there will remain nothing but a *Caput mortuum*. (Bassnet, Op. Cit.: 65-66)

However, this way of translating poetry was not unanimously adopted. Other translators adopted an approach to poetry that was different from the figure for figure theory. Discussing his translation of Dante's *Divina Commedia*, and defending his decision to translate into blank verse, Longfellow declared:

The only merit my book has is that it is exactly what Dante says, and not what the translator imagines he might have said if he had been an Englishman. In other words, while making it rhythmic, I have endeavoured to make it also as literal as a prose translation.... In translating Dante, something must be relinquished. Shall it be the beautiful rhyme that blossoms all along the line like a honeysuckle on the hedge? It must be, in order to retain something more precious than rhyme, namely, fidelity, truth, —the life of the hedge itself.... The business of a translator is to report what the author says, not to explain what he means. (Ibid)

Bassnett concludes the discussion on the theories of translation by saying that the main currents of translation typology in the great age of industrial capitalism and colonial expansion up to the First World War can loosely be classified as follows:

(1) Translation as a scholar's activity, where the pre-eminence of the SL text is assumed *de facto* over any TL version. (2) Translation as a means of encouraging the intelligent reader to return to the SL original. (3) Translation as a means of helping the TL reader become the equal of what Schleiermacher called the better reader of the original, through a deliberately contrived foreignness in the TL text. (4) Translation as a means whereby the individual translator who sees himself like Aladdin in the enchanted vaults (Rossetti's imaginative image) offers his own pragmatic choice to the TL reader. (5) Translation as a means through which the translator seeks to upgrade the status of the SL text because it is perceived as being on a lower cultural level. (Ibid: 76-77)

### 2.3.4 The Linguistic Turn

As Cheung puts it, in 1965, John Cunnison Catford (1917–2009) published *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*, in which he attempted to use a Hallidayan and Firthian linguistic model as the basis for a general translation theory. He went further than Nida and others in adopting ideas and terminology from linguistics, insisting that, "the theory of translation is essentially a theory of applied linguistics" (Catford 1965:19). Catford mentions the following two categories: (1.) Rank-bound translation: here, each word or morpheme in the source text receives an equivalent target text word or morpheme, enabling precise exchange. (2.) Unbounded translation: here, equivalence does not take place at the same level or rank but exchange can take place at the sentence, clause or other level.

Just like Catford, Newmark has also pointed out that in translation, exchange can take place at sentence and smaller units' levels. Ordudari (Op. Cit.: 81) says that Newmark (1988) mentions the difference between translation methods and translation procedures. He writes that, "While translation methods relate to whole texts, translation procedures are used for sentences and the smaller units of language."



Newmark's translation *methods* include:

-*Semantic translation*: which differs from 'faithful translation' only in as far as it must take more account of the aesthetic value of the SL text.

-*Adaptation*: which is the freest form of translation, and is used mainly for plays (comedies) and poetry; the themes, characters, plots are usually preserved, the SL culture is converted to the TL culture and the text is rewritten.

-*Free translation*: it produces the TL text without the style, form, or content of the original.

-*Idiomatic translation*: it reproduces the 'message' of the original but tends to distort nuances of meaning by preferring colloquialisms and idioms where these do not exist in the original.

-*Communicative translation*: it attempts to render the exact contextual meaning of the original in such a way that both content and language are readily acceptable and comprehensible to the readership (1988b: 45-47).

Newmark's translation *procedures* include:

*Transference*: it is the process of transferring an SL word to a TL text. It includes transliteration and is the same as what Harvey (2000:5) named "transcription."

*Naturalization*: it adapts the SL word first to the normal pronunciation, then to the normal morphology of the TL.

*Cultural equivalent*: it means replacing a cultural word in the SL with a TL one; however, "they are not accurate"

*Functional equivalent*: it requires the use of a culture-neutral word.

*Descriptive equivalent*: in this procedure the meaning of the CBT is explained in several words.

*Componential analysis*: it means "comparing an SL word with a TL word which has a similar meaning but is not an obvious one-to-one equivalent, by demonstrating first their common and then their differing sense components."

Other translation theorists mentioned by Ordudari include Zhongying, who advocates literal translation; Harvey, who upholds the theory of functional equivalence; Albakry, who calls for the use of glossing or explanatory notes in translation; Richards as well as Hervey and Higgins, who have prescribed rules for the translation of personal names and proposed terms like exotism and literal translation; Leppihalme (1997:79) who has proposed another set of strategies for translating the proper name allusions: (i) Retention of the name; (ii) replacement of the name by another; (iii) omission of the name.

### 2.3.5 Archaising

Cheung names Ezra Pound (1885–1972) who varied between domesticating and archaising strategies but "one consistent theme throughout was his insistence that translation seeks first to absorb and transform the ideas of the source text rather than to reproduce a set of words" (Apter 2006:275). In archaising, his methods would prove influential upon later thinkers such as Lawrence Venuti, who approved of his translation of the Anglo-Saxon text *The Seafarer* (1912) where the original metre is imitated along with recreations of source text words (e.g. "corna caldast"/'corn of the coldest'; "floodwegas"/'flood-ways'; "hægl scurum fleag"/'hail-scur flew'; "mæw singende fore medodrince"/'the mews' singing all my mead-drink.') As is typical of archaising strategies, the English target text is not necessarily readable, but that was not the goal. As Venuti has written, "Pound's translations signified the foreignness of the foreign text, not because they were faithful or accurate ... but because they deviated from domestic literary canons in English" (Venuti 2008:174-5).

### 2.3.6 Leitwort / Verbal atmosphere

Cheung says that unlike the translators of the King James Bible, who made use of a range of English synonyms, Buber and Rosenzweig preferred deliberate, multiple recurrences of the same words in order to recreate what Weissbort and Eysteinsson called the "verbal atmosphere" (2006:310) of the text. Buber discussed the use of this 'Leitwort' (leading word) technique in a lecture delivered in 1927 where he stated: “

By Leitwort I understand a word or word root that is meaningfully repeated within the text or sequence of texts or complex of texts; those who attend to these repetitions will find a meaning of the text revealed, clarified, or at any rate made more emphatic ... (Buber and Rosenzweig 1927/1994:166)

### 3. An evaluation of the Translation Theories

This evaluation comes up with the following postulates:

Translation is a full-fledged discipline: It has its own terminology and concepts and the relationship between a term and the concept it designates is mono-referential, i.e. a term is used to designate a single concept and every concept is designated by the same term. For example, the term transposition is used to describe a translation technique whereby a verb in the SL text can be translated by a noun in the TL text. This implies a change of grammatical category. Whenever this pattern is noticed in translation, it becomes obvious that it is a case of transposition. The same applies to other concepts such as modulation, calque, borrowing, etc. From this point of view, translation is a science. However, there are several other aspects which liken translation to an art. For example, a good translation reflects elements of eloquence and style. Translation definitely requires writing skills, rhetoric and excellent knowledge of languages. Somebody with a good literary background can be a good translator. After all, rhetoric, metaphoric language and the use of figures of speech in translation makes it very fluent.

Translation is related to linguistics: A good translator should have a linguistic background as well. Linguistics permeates many aspects of translation. Concepts such as dynamic equivalence, formal equivalence, restructuring, syntax, lexical semantics and structural meaning are linguistic concepts. Nida, Jakobson, Venuti and many other translators have applied linguistic theories to translation.

Translation theories reveal many facets of the craft: some of the theories are descriptive. For example, foreignisation and domestication describe how some translators orient translation towards the source language or the target language. It is a deliberate choice. Other theories are prescriptive. Hervey and Higgins, for example, have prescribed rules for the translation of personal names. Leppihalme has proposed a set of strategies for translating proper name allusions. Some other theories are pretty ideological and political in nature. The Skopos theory, for example, has an ideological agenda. What matters in this case is not the transfer of the sense of the SL text but the purpose of the translation.

Leitwort is a figure of speech: it has an overall impact on the semantics of a whole book or text. A case in point is a study carried out by Akpaca (2018) on the semantics of the French term *âme* in the French and English versions of the Jerusalem Bible. This study reveals that the term *âme* is polysemous. Indeed, it has at least 15 equivalents in the English version of the Bible. Below is a list of its equivalents in the English version of the Bible:

The Lexical Field of the Term “*âme*” in the English Version of the Jerusalem Bible and the Scope of the Concept

The term “*âme*” has been translated many times by the following words in the Bible.

1. Soul : 159 times
2. Spirit : 9 times
3. Heart : 24 times
4. Life : 21 times

5. Mind : 4 times
6. Self (myself, yourself, yourselves, himself, themselves, ourselves, I, me, you, he, we, they, them, us) : 80 times
7. Breath of life : once
8. Last breath : once
9. Whole being/human being : 6 times
10. Temper : once
11. Longings : once
12. Blood : once
13. Body : once
14. Adverbs : Sincerely, wholeheartedly, energetically, deadly, contemptuously : 5 times
15. In the rest of the instances, no equivalence of the term *âme* appears in the English translation (Akpaca, 2018: 56-57)

The French version of the Bible reflects the verbal atmosphere of the *leitwort âme* whereas the English version greatly expands the lexical field of the word. It is thanks to the English version of the Bible that the scope and extent of the term *âme* has been revealed. As a result, a translator's method can drastically restrict or expand vital information on lexical semantics as well as on structural meaning, syntax, stylistics, rhetoric, figures of speech, aspect and many other items.

Translation and the cultural turn: depending on the translator's strategy and method, translation can facilitate or stop the transfer of cultural information from a SL to a TL. If translation is promoted as a vehicle of language enrichment, it can facilitate the transfer of culturally significant worldviews and lexical items. In fact, our approach to translation depends on our attitude to foreigner cultures. If we like foreign cultures, we let in our language many foreign words and epitomes but if we don't like them, we filter our translations and make sure that we only get what we are used to.

Translation and poetry: translating poetry is quite challenging because a poem includes substantial and aesthetic aspects. Arnold nicely expresses the challenge involved in the translation of poetry.

Arnold encouraged his readers to have faith in the work of scholars, and entreated translators thus:

These are scholars; who possess, at the same time with knowledge of Greek, adequate poetical taste and feeling. No translation will seem to them of much worth compared with the original; but they alone can say, whether the translation produces more or less the same effect upon them as the original. They are the only competent tribunal in this matter: the Greeks are dead; the unlearned Englishman has not the data for judging; and no man can safely confide in his own single judgment of his own work. Let not the translator, then, trust to his notions of what the ancient Greeks would have thought of him; he will lose himself in the vague. Let him not trust to what the ordinary English reader thinks of him; he will be taking the blind for his guide. Let him not trust to his own judgment of his own work; he may be misled by individual caprices. Let him ask how his work affects those who both know Greek and can appreciate poetry. (Arnold 1861:4)

### 3.1 An attempt to formulate a modern theory of translation

Many are the theories that have so far been reviewed. However, it seems that some important aspects of modern professional translation have not been tackled in these theories. Some of these aspects are related to terminology and lexicology as well as to tense, aspect and modality. All in all, a modern translation theory should include the following:

1. Perfect understanding of the source language (SL) text and stylistic devices;
2. Excellent command of the target language (TL) and perfect writing skills;
3. The translation should be oriented towards the target language readers;
4. Peculiar lexical items and scientific and technical terms should be subjected to academic scrutiny and proper equivalents should be found;
5. Linguistic aspects pertaining to tense, aspect, modality, syntax and structure, stylistics and rhetoric should be compared and addressed in a professional manner;
6. The knowledge of translation procedures and methods is very important because it makes a difference between a professional translator and an amateur;
7. Technical and scientific concepts should be investigated into and their conceptual areas should be known to the translator, especially when it comes to specialised language used in the context of an international organisation or scientific research programmes;
8. Cultural information should be transferred in a natural manner that enables the TL reader to understand the nitty-gritty;
9. Political and ideological agendas should not be pursued in translation because translation is not about politics and ideology;
10. The training of translators should focus on a specific specialised area and should be organised in a way that constantly exposes them to the culture and institutions of the source language and to global realities.

## Conclusion

Bassnett rightly says that for much of pre-20th-century translation history, the viewpoints of translation theorists ebbed and flowed between the extremes of the free/literal debate, as identified by Cicero, with periodic attempts to find a middle way. Afterwards, translation theories opened up to new strategies and orientations including philosophy, linguistics and culture.

For one thing, the strategy or method adopted by a translator affects the final message as well as its structure and aesthetics. Translation is a science which has its own terminology and concepts; however, some of the theories tend to go too far beyond the limits of translation. Of particular concern are the theories concerning imitation, adaptation and political propaganda.

Linguistic issues such as tense, aspect and modality should be treated with care because these are context dependent issues. Lexical items, especially in specialised discourse, tend to be polysemous and should be interpreted adequately. Terminology is another major research area in translation in this globalisation era.

Translator training in the global era should focus on the theories of translation as well as on specialised areas.

## Bibliography

- Albakry, M. (2004). "Linguistic and cultural issues in literary translation." Retrieved November 17, 2006 from <http://accurapid.com/journal/29liter.htm>
- Apter, R. (2006). "Ezra Pound." In D. Weissbort and A. Eysteinsson (eds), 274-5.
- Arnold M., *On Translating Homer*, Lecture I, in *Essays by Matthew*
- Bassnett, S. (2002). *Translation Studies*. 3rd edn. London: Routledge.
- Bassnett, S. (2005). "History of Translation Theory." In *Translation Studies*, (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). London and New York.
- Belloc, H. (1931). *On Translation*. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1931.
- Benjamin, W. (1923 / 2000). "The task of the translator." In L. Venuti (ed.) (2004), 15-23.
- Buber, M. (1927 / 2006). "Leitwort Style." In *Pentateuch Narrative*. D. Weissbort & A. Eysteinsson (eds), 316-7.

- Buber, M. & Rosenzweig, F. (1927 / 1994). *Scripture and Translation*. Trans. by L. Rosenwald & E. Fox. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Catford, J.C. (1965). *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Cheung, A. (2011). *Functionalism and Foreignisation: Applying Skopos Theory to Bible Translation*. University of Birmingham, UK.
- Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Cicero, M. T. (46 BCE / 1997 CE). *The best kind of orator*, trans. by H. M. Hubbell (1960), in D. Robinson (ed.) (1997), 7-10.
- Cicero, *De optimo genere oratorum*, Loeb Classical Library, transl. H.M.Hubbell. London: Heinemann, 1959.
- Dolet, E. (1540). *La maniere de bien traduire d'une langue en aultre*, trans. by J. S. Holmes (1981), extracts reprinted in D. Weissbort & A. Eysteinsson (eds) (2006), 73-6.
- Horace. (1965). "On the Art of Poetry." In *Classical Literary Criticism*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, pp. 77–97.
- Jacobsen E. (1958). *Translation, A Traditional Craft*. Copenhagen: Nordisk Forlag.
- Lefevere, A. (1977). *Translating Literature. The German Tradition from Luther to Rosenzweig*. Assen/Amsterdam: Van Gorcum.
- Leppihalme, R. (1997). *Culture bumps: an empirical approach to the translation of allusions*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Malmkjær, K. (2005). *Linguistics and the Language of Translation*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Massey, N. (2009). "Translation and Interpreting Methods and Approaches." In *The Theories of Translation from History to Procedures*, Leeds, UK.
- Mbatchi, B. (2018). "A Contrastive Terminological Exploration of the French Term "âme" through its various Translations in the Jerusalem Bible. In *Revue Africaine et Malgache de Recherche Scientifique*, pp. 40-64.
- Munday, J. (2008). *Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications*. 2nd edn. London and New York: Routledge.
- Newmark, P. (1988) *A Textbook of Translation*. New York: Prentice-Hall International.
- Newmark, P. (1988b). *Approaches to Translation*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall.
- Nida, E. A. (1964). *Towards a science of translation, with special reference to principles and procedures involved in Bible translating*. Leiden: Brill.
- Nida, E. A. (1995). "Dynamic equivalence in translating." In S. Chan & D. Pollard (eds), 223-30.
- Nida, E. A. & Taber, C. R. (1969). *The Theory and Practice of Translation*. Leiden: Brill.
- Pym, A. (2004). *The Moving Text: Localization, Translation, and Distribution*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Ordudari, M. (2009). "Translation Procedures, Strategies and Methods." In *The Theories of Translation From History to Procedures*, pp. 120-127
- Reiss, K. & Vermeer, H. J. (1984). *Grundlegung Einer Allgemeinen Translationstheorie*. Tübingen: M. Niemeyer.
- Robinson, D. (1997a). *Translation and Empire: Postcolonial Theories Explained*. Manchester: St Jerome.
- Robinson, D. (1997b). *Translation and the repayment of debt*. *Delos* 7:1-2, 10-22.
- Robinson, D. (1997). *Western Translation Theory: From Herodotus to Nietzsche*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Salama-Carr, M. (2009). "French tradition." In M. Baker & G. Saldanha (eds) (2009), 404-9.
- Schleiermacher, F. (1813 / 2004). "On the different methods of translating", trans. S. Bernofsky, in L. Venuti (ed.), 43-63.
- Snell-Hornby, M. (2006). *The Turns of Translation Studies: New Paradigms or Shifting Viewpoints?* Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.
- Steiner, G. (1975). *After Babel*. London: Oxford University Press, 1975, pp. 236ff.
- Venuti, L. (1995). *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Venuti L. (1998). *The Scandals of Translation*. London and New York: Routledge, p. 46.
- Venuti, L. (1998). "Strategies of translation." In M. Baker (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of translation studies*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 240-244.

- Vermeer, H. J. (1989a / 2000). "Scopos and commission in translational action", trans. by A. Chesterman. In L. Venuti (ed.), 221-32.
- Vermeer, H. J. (1996). *A Skopos Theory of Translation (Some Arguments for and against)*. Heidelberg: TextconText Verlag.
- Weissbort, D. & Eysteinsson, A. (eds) (2006). *Translation Theory and Practice: A Historical Reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
-